

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1-16 are rejected. Claims 1 and 15 are amended and new claim 17 added. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments and new claim can be found throughout the application, for instance in the specification including page 5 (line 6) and the claims as originally filed. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot in view of the amendments indicated herein. Applicants urge withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for an alleged lack of possession. It is alleged that there is no support for claiming that the parts of the ratio between compound 1.b) and 1.a) are parts by weight.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants point out that the phrase “referred to the dry product” has been re-inserted into claim 1, see original claim 1, in order to make clear what is referred to by the term “parts.” It is therefore pointed out that “parts” refers to dry products, and that the units must be parts by weight, since those of ordinary skill in the art recognize that a dry product is never defined by mole or

volume units. Indeed, if the "parts" were intended as by moles or volume, the reference to a dry product would make no sense. The dry matter of a compound is always measured by weight, as is recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art. See page 5, line 23, of the application.

Applicants point out that the phrase "referred to the dry product" arises because the prepolymer compound 1.a) is obtainable by dissolving the IPDI trimer and the (per)fluoropolyether diol in an organic solvent at a temperature in the range of 40-80 °C. See claim 2; last paragraph at page 5 of the application. Thus, compound 1.a) is intended as the dry product or dry matter of the prepolymer solution. Applicants point to Example 1, wherein it is disclosed that the dry product is determined after evaporation of the volatile fraction. See page 14, lines 16-22 of the application. Moreover, as was indicated in the previous response of June 17, 2003, Example 2 demonstrates that the ratio is a ratio of parts by weight, for example:

$$3.91 \text{ g of HDI 1.b) / 10 g of prepolymer 1.a) (only dry matter)} = 0.391$$


$$0.391 = 39.1 \text{ parts by weight of 1.b) / 100 parts by weight of 1.a).}$$

Clearly, the ratio between compounds 1.b) and 1.a) is a ratio of parts by weight, and therefore, all rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request favorable action thereon.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, along with any other additional fees, which may be required with respect to this paper referencing Attorney Docket No. 108910-00022.

Respectfully submitted,
Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn

for 
Hans J. Crosby
Attorney for Applicants #39107
Registration No. 44,634

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

HJC:ccd